

Appl. No. 10/807,213
Amtd. Dated June 20, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 20, 2007

REMARKS

At first, applicants acknowledge the examiner's action mailed on 03/20/2007, and appreciate indication of allowabilities of claim 19-27, and 31.

1. Claim Objections

As kindly indicated by examiner in Office Action, inaccuracies originally in Claims 19-33 are corrected by applicants. So, Claim Objections should be withdrawn.

2. Claim rejections

Claims 28-30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pernet (US 5,860,821).

The examiner states that Pernet discloses substantially the claimed invention except for the second contact section *instead of the first contact section* transversely to the longitudinal direction, and further states that *this rearrangement only involves the routine skill in the art for simplifying the construction of the second terminal*. Applicant respectfully traverses it.

In Pernet, the second terminal (4) has the first relatively resilient deflectable section (24/25) which deflectably extends along the longitudinal direction and a first vertical plane perpendicular to the main plane and tends to be deformed/deflected away from the main plane when the second terminal (4) and the first terminal (5) are engaged with each other, while the second terminal (4) also has the second relatively resilient deflectable section (21, 22) which deflectably extends along the transverse direction and in a second vertical plane perpendicular to both said first vertical plane and said main plane, and tends to be

Appl. No. 10/807,213
Amdt. Dated June 20, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 20, 2007

deformed/deflected away from the main plane when the second terminal (4) and the first terminal (5) are engaged with each other. Oppositely, the first terminal (5) has no such resilient deflectable sections. Therefore, during mating, the first terminal (5) is relatively too stiff while the second terminal (4) is relatively too soft. From a mechanical viewpoint, it is not a good design.

Differently, in the instant invention, the first contact (12) also owns the relatively resilient section (123) which extends along the transverse direction and in the vertical plane perpendicular to the main plane, and tends to be deformed/deflected away from the main plane when the second contact (12) and the second contact (13) are engaged with each other. Accordingly, during mating both the first contact (12) and the second contact (13) own sufficient relative resiliencies, respectively. From the mechanical viewpoint, the arrangement of the instant invention can achieve a long term better reliable engagement.

In conclusion, the difference between the instant invention and the Pernet reference, i.e., the transverse extension of the contact section being formed on the first contact (the instant invention) instead of on the second contact (the Pernet reference), is NOT only the rearrangement involving the routine skill for simplifying the construction of the second contact (of the invention), but counterbalancing the resiliencies between the first contact and the second contact of the instant invention for achieving better reliable mechanical force dispersion and the associated electrical connection.

Based on above reasons, the allowance of amended Claim 28 is respectfully requested. Accordingly, Claims 29-33 are allowable for their dependencies from amended Claim 28, either directly or indirectly.

Appl. No. 10/807,213
Amdt. Dated June 20, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 20, 2007

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
LEE ET AL

By


Wei-Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel No.: (408) 919-6137